



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/578,648	05/09/2006	Holger R. Scholl	DE 030373	1808

24737 7590 12/05/2008
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, QUYNH H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2614

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

12/05/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. Claims 1 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Schaffer et al. (2002/0108113).

As to claims 1 and 13, Schaffer teaches a system and method for program recommendation comprising the steps of: accessing program information ([0072]) where the program information comprises a plurality of broadcast channels, a broadcast time of content pieces broadcast at the channels, and a content description of the content pieces ([0029] - [0030], [0035], [0063]); selecting pieces of content within a time interval (Fig. 3A; [0025]); calculating for a plurality of content pieces a piece score, the piece score indicating a match of the content description with a profile ([0028], [0036], [0053]); determining a plurality of sequences of content pieces, where the content pieces contained in the sequences are broadcast consecutively at the channels ([0034] - [0035]); calculating for the sequences a sequence score, based at least on the pieces scores of pieces contained in the sequence and on a correlation of the content descriptions of at least two of the pieces contained in the sequence ([0028], [0036], [0053]; [0055]); and selecting at least one of the sequences according to the sequence score ([0038], [0056]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. Claims 2-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schaffer et al. (2002/0108113) in view of Pachet et al. (EP1170722 A).

As to claim 2, Schaffer does not explicitly teach selection means are configured to calculate the sequence score according to one or more rules and the sequence score is calculated from the pieces score and the correlation values.

Pachet teaches selection means are configured to calculate the sequence score according to one or more rules and the sequence score is calculated from the pieces score and the correlation values ([0070] - [0076]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Pachet into the teachings of Schaffer in order to have a more efficient system and resulting better sequence score and correlation values.

As to claims 3-5 and 7, Pachet teaches the selection means are configured to calculate the path score such that it is lower the more switchovers from a first content piece of the sequence to a second content piece, if two or more content pieces in a sequence are of a common type or does not contain content pieces of predetermined type ([0042] - [0044]).

As to claim 6, Pachet teaches the selection means are configured to pre-select a number of sequence based on the piece scores of the content pieces of the sequences, and calculate path scores only for the pre-select sequences ([0043] - [0048]).

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claim 8 and its dependent would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the possible 101 rejection set forth in this Office action.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 10/10/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Schaffer does not teach selection means for selecting pieces of content within a time interval. Examiner respectfully submits that Schaffer teaches Fig. 3A shows a recommendations list type listed in decreasing order of strength of recommendation, for example Presidential Debate starts in 5 minutes, and hence this read on the above limitation. Applicant argues that Schaffer does not teach "calculating for said sequences a sequence score, based at least on said piece scores of the pieces contained in said sequence...". Examiner respectfully submits that Schaffer teaches the nominal recommendation may be a function calculated based on personal profile ([0028]); a program recommender calculates a prioritized list of potential show occurring around now [0053]; a recommendation score determined in the section on analytical formulation and function value is calculated ([0055]), hence this read on the above limitation. In addition, Applicant merely argues that the combination with secondary reference Pachet might involve taking the maximum of the final

recommendation of the present show and the next show. Examiner respectfully submits that this is irrelevant.

Furthermore, claims 1 and 8 are drawn to a system comprises various means. The specification suggests that the method may be implemented as a computer program... ([0036]). Therefore the specification provides evidence that the claimed system cover nonstatutory embodiment, i.e. software per se. Claim 13 is a method claim. In order for a method to be considered a “process” under 101, a claimed process must either (1) be tied to another statutory class (such as a particular apparatus) or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) (*Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); *Parker v. Flook*, 437 U.S. 584 n.9 (1978); *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972); *Cochrane v. Deener*, 94 U.S. 780, 787-788 (1876)). If neither of these requirements is met by the claims, the method is not a patent eligible process under 101 and is non-statutory subject matter. Thus, to qualify as a statutory process, the claim should positively recite the other statutory class (the thing or product) to which it is tied, for example, by identifying the apparatus that accomplishes the method steps, or positively recite the subject matter that is being transformed, for example, by identifying the material that is being changed to a different state. Failure to make appropriate corrections would lead to 101 rejection.

Claims 1 and 8 recite “System for program recommendation with” should be --
System for program recommendation comprising: --. Appropriate corrections required.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to QUYNH H. NGUYEN whose telephone number is 571-272-7489. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 6:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad Matar, can be reached on 571-272-7488. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

Art Unit: 2614

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Quynh H Nguyen/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2614